



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/087,552	02/26/2002	David Ethan Zoller	MS1-895US	2157
22801	7590	01/07/2005	EXAMINER	
LEE & HAYES PLLC 421 W RIVERSIDE AVENUE SUITE 500 SPOKANE, WA 99201			ABDULSELAM, ABBAS I	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER

2674

DATE MAILED: 01/07/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/087,552

Applicant(s)

ZOLLER

Examiner

Abbas I Abdulsalam

Art Unit

2674

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 12 July 2004.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-65 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-65 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION***Response to Arguments***

1. Applicant's arguments filed on 07/12/04 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant argues that Saxena et al. (hereinafter = "Saxena") does not teach, "at least one identifier that identifies that said second GUI is not associated with said first computing device". However, as shown in the art rejection below, it would have been obvious that the GUIs (500, 600, 700, 800) are associated with their corresponding devices as shown in Fig. 3, and not with the main user interface shown in Fig. 4. One of ordinary skill in the art would have ascertained that any of the two GUIs (500, 600, 700, 800) would meet the desired first and second GUIs. For example, Saxena teaches when a user selects option button (412) labeled "Message" on the main user interface (400), an extended display panel for the message application is displayed as shown in Fig. 5, which displays the extended panel for the message application of the integrated communication center as graphical user interface (500). Like wise, Saxena teaches that a phone book function and user interface (700) is accessed by selecting the phone book option button (428) on the main user interface 400 for the integrated communication center. Saxena indicates as shown in Fig. 7 that the phone book user interface (700) includes the main integrated communication center interface 400 and a phone book extended panel 702. It would have been obvious that the phone book user interface (700) is associated with the phone book option button (428), but not with selects option button (412), and hence the option buttons provide the desired functionalities of the first and second computing device.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claim 1-65 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Saxena et al. (USPN 6259449).

Regarding claim 1, Saxena teaches a method comprising: displaying a first graphical user interface (GUI) on a display screen, the first GUI being associated with a program operatively configured on a first computing device (col. 1, lines 47-54, Fig. 3 (302), Fig. 4 (400, 416), col. 8, lines 28-37 and Fig. 6 (600, 604)); and displaying a second GUI on said display screen over said first GUI; (col. 1, lines 54-57, col. 9, lines 52-59 and Fig. 5 (500, 504)), the second GUI being associated with a program (col. 1, lines 62-67 and col. 2, 1-4) operatively configured on a second computing device that is operatively connected to said first computing device (Fig. 3 (316), Fig. 4, col. 4, lines 36-43 and col. 8, lines 32-37), and wherein said second GU is displayed on substantially the full screen of said display screen (col. 9, lines 60-63 and Fig. 5 (504)).

Saxena does not specifically teach “at least one identifier that identifies that the second GUI is not associated with said first computing device”. Saxena on the other hand teaches as addressed above, an integrated communication center interface (400) in the form of a cellular telephone including an LCD graphical display (416), and several option buttons for accessing the various communication applications. See Fig. 4 and col. 8, lines 28-47. Saxena also teaches that

Art Unit: 2674

extension panel display screens corresponding to various communication functions such as messages (with GUI (500)), mailboxes (with GUI (600)), phone books, (with GUI 700) and greetings (with GUI (800)) are displayed when appropriate functions are selected in the main interface. Saxena further teaches that the extension panel screens are displayed as physical extensions to the cellular telephone display, and can be revealed or hidden by a toggle option button. See col. 1, lines 62-67 and col. 2, lines 1-7 and Fig. 3 (304, 306, 308, 310, 312, 314).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to utilize Saxena's communication functions for the purpose of identifying graphical user interfaces corresponding to different extension panel display screens. One would have been motivated in view of the suggestion in Saxena that the communication functions can be equivalently used as the desired "identifier".

In addition, Saxena teaches that the GUIs (500, 600, 700, 800) correspond to separate devices such as speakerphone (304), and answering machine (308) as shown in Fig. 3. Hence it would have been obvious that the GUIs (500, 600, 700, 800) are associated with their corresponding devices as shown in Fig. 3, and not with the main user interface shown in Fig. 4.

Regarding claim 2, Saxena teaches at least one of said first and said second GUIs is a desktop GUI associated with an operating system (col. 8, lines 8-25 and Fig. 3 (314)).

Regarding claim 3, Saxena teaches at least one of said first and said second GUIs is an application GUI associated with an application program (col. 7, lines 51-57 and Fig. 3 (312)).

Regarding claim 4, Saxena teaches the second GUI is displayed in full screen mode on said display screen, such that none of said first GUI is visible to said user (col. 1, lines 47-61, col. 2, lines 1-7. It would have been obvious to utilize one of the communication functions in order to display extension panel screens overlapping the first interface screen).

Regarding claim 5, Saxena teaches at least one identifier is selectively displayed for a defined period of time and then no longer displayed until reactivated (col. 2, lines 1-7, col. 8, lines 48-61 and col. 14, lines 9-13. It would have been obvious to utilize one of the communication functions to assign an interval of time over which a display takes place).

Regarding claim 6, Saxena at least one identifier is reactivated after a defined period of time expires since said at least one identifier was last displayed (col. 2, lines 1-7, col. 8, lines 48-61 and col. 14, lines 9-13. It would have been obvious to utilize one of the communication functions to reactivate after an elapse of a predetermined time).

Regarding claim 7, Saxena teaches at least one identifier is reactivated after the user causes a pointing device controlled cursor to enter into a defined region of said second GUI (col. 2, lines 1-7, col. 8, lines 48-61 and col. 14, lines 9-13. It would have been obvious to utilize one of the communication functions to reactivate after an elapse of a predetermined time (col. 3, lines 57-60 and Fig. 2 (222, 220)).

Art Unit: 2674

Regarding claim 8, Saxena teaches at least one identifier is reactivated after the user causes a pointing device controlled cursor to enter into a defined region of said second GUI and said cursor remains in said region for a definable period of time (col. 2, lines 1-7, col. 8, lines 48-61 and col. 14, lines 9-13. It would have been obvious to utilize one of the communication functions to reactivate after an elapse of a predetermined time (col. 3, 57-60, Fig. 2 (222, 220)).

Regarding claim 9, Saxena teaches at least one identifier is selectively displayed based on at least one user keyboard input (It would have been obvious to utilize Saxena's communication functions for the purpose of identifying graphical user interfaces corresponding to different extension panel display screens; Fig. 2 (222, 221) and col. 3, lines 55-60).

Regarding claim 10, Saxena teaches at least one identifier is selectively displayed by said program operatively configured on said second computing device (Fig. 3 (304, 306, 308, 310, 312, 314) and col. 4, lines 31-41).

Regarding claim 11, Saxena teaches at least one identifier includes information identifying said second computing device (Fig. 3 (304, 306, 308, 310, 312, 314) and col. 4, lines 31-41).

Regarding claim 12, Saxena teaches at least one identifier includes at least one user selectable feature that is operatively configured to provide at least one user input to said second

Art Unit: 2674

computing device (Fig. 3, for example Fax (310); col. 4, lines 31-41).

Regarding claim 13, a method comprising: generating graphical user interface (GUI) data suitable for being displayed on a display screen, the GUI data being associated with a program operatively configured on a computing device (col. 1, lines 47-54, Fig. 3 (302), Fig. 4 (400, 416) and col. 8, lines 28-37); that is configurable to be operatively coupled to another computing device, wherein said another computing device is connected to said display screen (Fig. 3 (316), Fig. 4, col. 4, lines 36-43 and col. 8, lines 32-37), and if displayed on said display screen said GUI data is configured to use substantially the full screen of said display screen (col.9, lines 60-63 and Fig. 5 (504)).

Saxena does not specifically teach, "GUI data that includes data for displaying at least one identifier that identifies that said GUI data is associated with said computing device. Saxena on the other hand teaches as addressed above, an integrated communication center interface (400) in the form of a cellular telephone including an LCD graphical display (416), and several option buttons for accessing the various communication applications. See Fig. 4 and col. 8, lines 28-47. Saxena also teaches that extension panel display screens corresponding to various communication functions such as messages (with GUI (500)), mailboxes (with GUI (600)), phone books, (with GUI 700) and greetings (with GUI (800)) are displayed when appropriate functions are selected in the main interface. Saxena further teaches that the extension panel screens are displayed as physical extensions to the cellular telephone display, and can be revealed or hidden by a toggle option button. See col. 1, lines 62-67 and col. 2, lines 1-7 and Fig. 3 (304, 306, 308, 310, 312, 314).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to utilize Saxena's communication functions for the purpose of identifying graphical user interfaces corresponding to different extension panel display screens. One would have been motivated in view of the suggestion in Saxena that the communication functions can be equivalently used as the desired "identifier".

In addition, Saxena teaches that the GUIs (500, 600, 700, 800) correspond to separate devices such as speakerphone (304), and answering machine (308) as shown in Fig. 3. Hence it would have been obvious that the GUIs (500, 600, 700, 800) are associated with their corresponding devices as shown in Fig. 3.

Regarding claim 14, Saxena teaches that GUI data includes desktop GUI data associated with an operating system running on said computing device (col. 8, lines 8-25 and Fig. 3 (314)).

Regarding claim 15, Saxena teaches that GUI data includes application GUI data associated with an application program running on said computing device (col. 7, lines 51-57 and Fig. 3 (312)).

Regarding claim 16, Saxena teaches medium having computer-executable instructions (see the abstract) for performing acts comprising: displaying a first graphical user interface (GUI) on a display screen, the first GUI being associated with a program operatively configured on a first computing device (col. 1, lines 47-54, Fig. 3 (302), Fig. 4 (400, 416) and col. 8, lines

Art Unit: 2674

28-37); and displaying a second GUI on said display screen over said first GUI (col. 1, lines 54-57, col. 9, lines 52-59 and Fig. 5 (500, 504)), the second GUI being associated with a program (col. 1, lines 62-67 and col. 2, 1-4) operatively configured on a second computing device that is operatively connected to said first computing device (Fig. 3 (316), Fig. 4, col. 4, lines 36-43, and col. 8, lines 32-37), and wherein said second GUI is displayed on substantially the full screen of said display screen (col. 9, lines 60-63, Fig. 5 (504)).

Saxena does not specifically teach “at least one identifier that identifies that the second GUI is not associated with said first computing device”. Saxena on the other hand teaches as addressed above, an integrated communication center interface (400) in the form of a cellular telephone including an LCD graphical display (416), and several option buttons for accessing the various communication applications. See Fig. 4 and col. 8, lines 28-47. Saxena also teaches that extension panel display screens corresponding to various communication functions such as messages (with GUI (500)), mailboxes (with GUI (600)), phone books, (with GUI 700) and greetings (with GUI (800)) are displayed when appropriate functions are selected in the main interface. Saxena further teaches that the extension panel screens are displayed as physical extensions to the cellular telephone display, and can be revealed or hidden by a toggle option button. See col. 1, lines 62-67 and col. 2, lines 1-7 and Fig. 3 (304, 306, 308, 310, 312, 314).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to utilize Saxena’s communication functions for the purpose of identifying graphical user interfaces corresponding to different extension panel display screens. One would

Art Unit: 2674

have been motivated in view of the suggestion in Saxena that the communication functions can be equivalently used as the desired “identifier”.

Regarding claim 17, Saxena teaches at least one of said first and said second GUIs is a desktop GUI associated with an operating system (col. 8, lines 8-25 and Fig. 3 (314)).

Regarding claim 18, Saxena teaches at least one of said first and said second GUIs is an application GUI associated with an application program (col. 7, lines 51-57 and Fig. 3 (312)).

Regarding claim 19, Saxena teaches at least one identifier is selectively displayed for a defined period of time and then no longer displayed until reactivated (col. 2, lines 1-7, col. 8, lines 48-61 and col. 14, lines 9-13. It would have been obvious to utilize one of the communication functions to assign an interval of time over which a display takes place).

Regarding claim 20, Saxena teaches at least one identifier includes information identifying said second computing device (Fig. 3 (304, 306, 308, 310, 312, 314) and col. 4, lines 31-41).

Regarding claim 21, Saxena teaches at least one identifier includes at least one user selectable feature that is operatively configured to provide at least one user input to said second computing device (Fig. 3. for example Fax (310); col. 4, lines 31-41).

Regarding claim 22, Saxena teaches a computer-readable medium having computer-executable instructions (see the abstract) for performing acts comprising: generating graphical user interface (GUI) data suitable for being displayed on a display screen, the GUI data being associated with a program operatively configured on a computing device (col. 1, lines 47-54, Fig. 3 (302), Fig. 4 (400, 416) and col. 8, lines 28-37); that is configurable to be operatively coupled to another computing device, wherein said another computing device is connected to said display screen (Fig. 3 (316), Fig. 4, col. 4, lines 36-43 and col. 8, lines 32-37) and generating said GUI data such that if displayed on said display screen said GUI data uses substantially the full screen of said display screen (col.9, lines 60-63 and Fig. 5 (504)).

Saxena does not teach, “generating said GUI data to include data for displaying at least one identifier that identifies that said GUI data is associated with said computing device”.

Saxena on the other hand teaches as addressed above, an integrated communication center interface (400) in the form of a cellular telephone including an LCD graphical display (416), and several option buttons for accessing the various communication applications. See Fig. 4 and col. 8, lines 28-47. Saxena also teaches that extension panel display screens corresponding to various communication functions such as messages (with GUI (500)), mailboxes (with GUI (600)), phone books, (with GUI 700) and greetings (with GUI (800)) are displayed when appropriate functions are selected in the main interface. Saxena further teaches that the extension panel screens are displayed as physical extensions to the cellular telephone display, and can be revealed or hidden by a toggle option button. See col. 1, lines 62-67 and col. 2, lines 1-7 and Fig. 3 (304, 306, 308, 310, 312, 314).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to utilize Saxena's communication functions for the purpose of identifying graphical user interfaces corresponding to different extension panel display screens. One would have been motivated in view of the suggestion in Saxena that the communication functions can be equivalently used as the desired "identifier".

In addition, Saxena teaches that the GUIs (500, 600, 700, 800) correspond to separate devices such as speakerphone (304), and answering machine (308) as shown in Fig. 3. Hence it would have been obvious that the GUIs (500, 600, 700, 800) are associated with their corresponding devices as shown in Fig. 3.

Regarding claim 23, Saxena teaches GUI data that includes desktop GUI data associated with an operating system running on said computing device (col. 8, lines 8-25 and Fig. 3 (314)).

Regarding claim 24, Saxena teaches that GUI data includes application GUI data associated with an application program running on said computing device (col. 7, lines 51-57 and Fig. 3 (312)).

Regarding claim 25, Saxena teaches a system comprising: a display screen; a communication link (Fig. 3, for example a sound card, speaker, col. 5, lines 34-37); a first computing device operatively coupled to said display screen and said communication link (Fig. 3), and configured to display a first graphical user interface (GUI) on said display screen, the first GUI being associated with a program running on said first computing device (col. 1, lines

Art Unit: 2674

47-54, Fig. 3 (302), Fig. 4 (400, 416) and col. 8, lines 28-37) ; a second computing device operatively coupled to said communication link (Fig. 3) and thusly said first computing device, said second computing device being configured to display a second GUI on said display screen over said first GUI (col. 1, lines 54-57, col. 9, lines 52-59 and Fig. 5 (500, 504)), the second GUI being associated with a program (col. 1, lines 62-67 and col. 2, 1-4) operatively configured on said second computing device, and wherein said second GUI is displayed on substantially the full screen of said display screen (col. 9, lines 60-63 and Fig. 5 (504)).

Saxena does not specifically teach “at least one identifier that identifies that the second GUI is not associated with said first computing device”. Saxena on the other hand teaches as addressed above, an integrated communication center interface (400) in the form of a cellular telephone including an LCD graphical display (416), and several option buttons for accessing the various communication applications. See Fig. 4 and col. 8, lines 28-47. Saxena also teaches that extension panel display screens corresponding to various communication functions such as messages (with GUI (500)), mailboxes (with GUI (600)), phone books, (with GUI 700) and greetings (with GUI (800)) are displayed when appropriate functions are selected in the main interface. Saxena further teaches that the extension panel screens are displayed as physical extensions to the cellular telephone display, and can be revealed or hidden by a toggle option button. See col. 1, lines 62-67 and col. 2, lines 1-7 and Fig. 3 (304, 306, 308, 310, 312, 314). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to utilize Saxena’s communication functions for the purpose of identifying graphical user interfaces corresponding to different extension panel display screens. One would have been

Art Unit: 2674

motivated in view of the suggestion in Saxena that the communication functions can be equivalently used as the desired “identifier”.

Regarding claim 26, Saxena teaches at least one of said first and said second GUIs is a desktop GUI associated with an operating system (col. 8, lines 8-25 and Fig. 3 (314)).

Regarding claim 27, Saxena teaches at least one of said first and said second GUIs is an application GUI associated with an application program (col. 7, lines 51-57 and Fig. 3 (312)).

Regarding claim 28, Saxena teaches the second GUI is displayed in full screen mode on said display screen, such that none of said first GUI is visible to said user (col. 1, lines 47-61, col. 2, lines 1-7. It would have been obvious to utilize one of the communication functions in order to display extension panel screens overlapping the first interface screen).

Regarding claim 29, Saxena teaches at least one identifier is selectively displayed for a defined period of time and then no longer displayed until reactivated (col. 2, lines 1-7, col. 8, lines 48-61 and col. 14, lines 9-13. It would have been obvious to utilize one of the communication functions to assign an interval of time over which a display takes place).

Regarding claim 30, Saxena teaches at least one identifier is reactivated after a defined period of time expires since said at least one identifier was last displayed (col. 2, lines 1-7, col. 8,

lines 48-61 and col. 14, lines 9-13. It would have been obvious to utilize one of the communication functions to reactivate after an elapse of a predetermined time).

Regarding claim 31, Saxena teaches at least one identifier is reactivated after the user causes a pointing device controlled cursor to enter into a defined region of said second GUI (col. 2, lines 1-7, col. 8, lines 48-61 and col. 14, lines 9-13. It would have been obvious to utilize one of the communication functions to reactivate after an elapse of a predetermined time; col. 3, lines 57-60 and Fig. 2 (222, 220)).

Regarding claim 32, Saxena teaches a pointing device operatively coupled to said first computing device; and wherein said at least one identifier is reactivated after the user causes a pointing device controlled cursor to enter into a defined region of said second GUI and said cursor remains in said region for a definable period of time (col. 2, lines 1-7, col. 8, lines 48-61 and col. 14, lines 9-13. It would have been obvious to utilize one of the communication functions to reactivate after an elapse of a predetermined time; col. 3, 57-60, Fig. 2 (222, 220)).

Regarding claim 33, Saxena teaches at least one identifier is selectively displayed based on at least one user keyboard input (It would have been obvious to utilize Saxena's communication functions for the purpose of identifying graphical user interfaces corresponding to different extension panel display screens; Fig. 2 (222, 221) and col. 3, lines 55-60).

Regarding claim 34, Saxena teaches at least one identifier is selectively displayed by said second computing device (Fig. 3 (304, 306, 308, 310, 312, 314) and col. 4, lines 31-41).

Regarding claim 35, Saxena teaches at least one identifier includes information identifying said second computing device (Fig. 3 (304, 306, 308, 310, 312, 314) and col. 4, lines 31-41).

Regarding claim 36, Saxena teaches at least one identifier includes at least one user selectable feature that is operatively configured to provide at least one user input to said second computing device (Fig. 3., for example Fax (310); col. 4, lines 31-41).

Regarding claim 37, Saxena teaches an apparatus comprising: a computing device capable of being operatively connected to at least one other computing device through an interconnecting communication channel, said computing device having logic configured to generate graphical user interface (GUI) data suitable for display on a display screen (col. 1, lines 47-54, Fig. 3 (302), Fig. 4 (400, 416) and col. 8, lines 28-37) coupled to said other computing device (Fig. 3 (316)), wherein if displayed on said display screen said GUI data is configured to use substantially the full screen of said display screen (col. 9, lines 60-63 and Fig. 5 (504)).

Saxena does not teach GUI data that includes data for displaying at least one identifier that identifies that said GUI data is associated with said computing device". Saxena on the other hand teaches as addressed above, an integrated communication center interface (400) in the form of a cellular telephone including an LCD graphical display (416), and several option buttons for accessing the various communication applications. See Fig. 4 and col. 8, lines 28-47. Saxena also

Art Unit: 2674

teaches that extension panel display screens corresponding to various communication functions such as messages (with GUI (500)), mailboxes (with GUI (600)), phone books, (with GUI 700) and greetings (with GUI (800)) are displayed when appropriate functions are selected in the main interface. Saxena further teaches that the extension panel screens are displayed as physical extensions to the cellular telephone display, and can be revealed or hidden by a toggle option button. See col. 1, lines 62-67 and col. 2, lines 1-7 and Fig. 3 (304, 306, 308, 310, 312, 314).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to utilize Saxena's communication functions for the purpose of identifying graphical user interfaces corresponding to different extension panel display screens. One would have been motivated in view of the suggestion in Saxena that the communication functions can be equivalently used as the desired "identifier".

In addition, Saxena teaches that the GUIs (500, 600, 700, 800) correspond to separate devices such as speakerphone (304), and answering machine (308) as shown in Fig. 3. Hence it would have been obvious that the GUIs (500, 600, 700, 800) are associated with their corresponding devices as shown n Fig. 3.

Regarding claim 38, Saxena teaches that GUI data includes desktop GUI data associated with operating system logic configured on said computing device (col. 8, lines 8-25 and Fig. 3 (314)).

Art Unit: 2674

Regarding claim 39, Saxena teaches that GUI data includes application GUI data associated with application program logic configured on said computing device (col. 8, lines 8-25 and Fig. 3 (314)).

Regarding claim 40, Saxena teaches a method comprising: displaying a first graphical user interface (GUI) on a display screen, the first GUI being associated with a first program (col. 1, lines 47-54, Fig. 3 (302), Fig. 4 (400, 416) and col. 8, lines 28-37); and displaying a second GUI on said display screen over said first GUI (col. 1, lines 54-57, col. 9, lines 52-59 and Fig. 5 (500, 504)), the second GUI being associated with a second program (col. 1, lines 62-67 and col. 2, lines 1-4), and wherein said second GUI is displayed on substantially the full screen of said display screen (col. 9, lines 60-63 and Fig. 5 (504)).

Saxena does not teach, “least one identifier that identifies that said second GUI is not associated with said first program”. Saxena on the other hand teaches as addressed above, an integrated communication center interface (400) in the form of a cellular telephone including an LCD graphical display (416), and several option buttons for accessing the various communication applications. See Fig. 4 and col. 8, lines 28-47. Saxena also teaches that extension panel display screens corresponding to various communication functions such as messages (with GUI (500)), mailboxes (with GUI (600)), phone books, (with GUI 700) and greetings (with GUI (800)) are displayed when appropriate functions are selected in the main interface. Saxena further teaches that the extension panel screens are displayed as physical extensions to the cellular telephone display, and can be revealed or hidden by a toggle option button. See col. 1, lines 62-67 and col. 2, lines 1-7 and Fig. 3 (304, 306, 308, 310, 312, 314).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to utilize Saxena's communication functions for the purpose of identifying graphical user interfaces corresponding to different extension panel display screens. One would have been motivated in view of the suggestion in Saxena that the communication functions can be equivalently used as the desired "identifier".

In addition, Saxena teaches that the GUIs (500, 600, 700, 800) correspond to separate devices such as speakerphone (304), and answering machine (308) as shown in Fig. 3. Hence it would have been obvious that the GUIs (500, 600, 700, 800) are associated with their corresponding devices as shown in Fig. 3, and not with the main user interface shown in Fig. 4.

Regarding claim 41, Saxena teaches at least one of said first and said second GUIs is a desktop GUI associated with an operating system (col. 8, lines 8-25 and Fig. 3 (314)).

Regarding claim 42, Saxena teaches at least one of said first and said second GUIs is an application GUI associated with an application program (col. 7, lines 51-57 and Fig. 3 (312)).

Regarding claim 43, Saxena teaches that the second GUI is displayed in full screen mode on said display screen, such that none of said first GUI is visible to said user (col. 1, lines 47-61, col. 2, lines 1-7. It would have been obvious to utilize one of the communication functions in order to display extension panel screens overlapping the first interface screen).

Regarding claim 44, Saxena teaches at least one identifier is selectively displayed for a defined period of time and then no longer displayed until reactivated (col. 2, lines 1-7, col. 8, lines 48-61 and col. 14, lines 9-13. It would have been obvious to utilize one of the communication functions to assign an interval of time over which a display takes place).

Regarding claim 45, Saxena teaches at least one identifier is reactivated after a defined period of time expires since said at least one identifier was last displayed (col. 2, lines 1-7, col. 8, lines 48-61 and col. 14, lines 9-13. It would have been obvious to utilize one of the communication functions to reactivate after an elapse of a predetermined time).

Regarding claim 46, Saxena teaches at least one identifier is reactivated after the user causes a pointing device controlled cursor to enter into a defined region of said second GUI (col. 2, lines 1-7, col. 8, lines 48-61 and col. 14, lines 9-13. It would have been obvious to utilize one of the communication functions to reactivate after an elapse of a predetermined time; col. 3, lines 57-60 and Fig. 2 (222, 220)).

Regarding claim 47, Saxena teaches at least one identifier is reactivated after the user causes a pointing device controlled cursor to enter into a defined region of said second GUI and said cursor remains in said region for a definable period of time (col. 2, lines 1-7, col. 8, lines 48-61 and col. 14, lines 9-13. It would have been obvious to utilize one of the communication functions to reactivate after an elapse of a predetermined time; col. 3, 57-60, Fig. 2 (222, 220)).

Regarding claim 48, Saxena teaches at least one identifier is selectively displayed based on at least one user keyboard input (It would have been obvious to utilize Saxena's communication functions for the purpose of identifying graphical user interfaces corresponding to different extension panel display screens; Fig. 2 (222, 221) and col. 3, lines 55-60).

Regarding claim 49, Saxena teaches at least one identifier includes information identifying said second program (Fig. 3 (304, 306, 308, 310, 312, 314) and col. 4, lines 31-41).

Regarding claim 50, Saxena teaches at least one identifier includes at least one user selectable feature that is operatively configured to provide at least one user input to said second program (Fig. 3., for example Fax (310); col. 4, lines 31-41).

Regarding claim 51, Saxena teaches said first program and said second program are operatively running on at least one processing unit within a single computer (Fig. 2 (202) and col. 3 and lines 28-46).

Regarding claim 52, Saxena teaches said first program and said second program are operatively running on at processing units within different computers (Fig. 1 (102, 104), and col. 3 and lines 28-46).

Regarding claim 53, Saxena teaches a computer readable medium having computer implement able instructions (see the abstract) for performing acts comprising: displaying a first graphical user interface (GUI) on a display screen, the first GUI being associated with a first program (col. 1, lines 47-54, Fig. 3 (302), Fig. 4 (400, 416) and col. 8, lines 28-37); and displaying a second GUI on said display screen over said first GUI, the second GUI being associated with a second program (Fig. 3 (316), Fig. 4, col. 4, lines 36-43 and col. 8, lines 32-37), and wherein said second GUI is displayed on substantially the full screen of said display screen (col. 9, lines 60-63, Fig. 5 (504)).

Saxena does not specifically teach “at least one identifier that identifies that the second GUI is not associated with said first program”. Saxena on the other hand teaches as addressed above, an integrated communication center interface (400) in the form of a cellular telephone including an LCD graphical display (416), and several option buttons for accessing the various communication applications. See Fig. 4 and col. 8, lines 28-47. Saxena also teaches that extension panel display screens corresponding to various communication functions such as messages (with GUI (500)), mailboxes (with GUI (600)), phone books, (with GUI 700) and greetings (with GUI (800)) are displayed when appropriate functions are selected in the main interface. Saxena further teaches that the extension panel screens are displayed as physical extensions to the cellular telephone display, and can be revealed or hidden by a toggle option button. See col. 1, lines 62-67 and col. 2, lines 1-7 and Fig. 3 (304, 306, 308, 310, 312, 314).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to utilize Saxena’s communication functions for the purpose of identifying graphical user interfaces corresponding to different extension panel display screens. One would

Art Unit: 2674

have been motivated in view of the suggestion in Saxena that the communication functions can be equivalently used as the desired “identifier”.

In addition, Saxena teaches that the GUIs (500, 600, 700, 800) correspond to separate devices such as speakerphone (304), and answering machine (308) as shown in Fig. 3. Hence it would have been obvious that the GUIs (500, 600, 700, 800) are associated with their corresponding devices as shown in Fig. 3, and not with the main user interface and its corresponding program shown in Fig. 4.

Regarding claim 54, Saxena teaches at least one of said first and said second GUIs is a desktop GUI associated with an operating system (col. 8, lines 8-25 and Fig. 3 (314)).

Regarding claim 55, Saxena teaches at least one of said first and said second GUIs is an application GUI associated with an application program (col. 7, lines 51-57 and Fig. 3 (312)).

Regarding claim 56, Saxena teaches said second GUI is displayed in full screen mode on said display screen, such that none of said first GUI is visible to said user (col. 1, lines 47-61, col. 2, lines 1-7. It would have been obvious to utilize one of the communication functions in order to display extension panel screens overlapping the first interface screen).

Regarding claim 57, Saxena teaches at least one identifier is selectively displayed for a defined period of time and then no longer displayed until reactivated (col. 2, lines 1-7, col. 8,

Art Unit: 2674

lines 48-61 and col. 14, lines 9-13. It would have been obvious to utilize one of the communication functions to assign an interval of time over which a display takes place).

Regarding claim 58, Saxena teaches at least one identifier is reactivated after a defined period of time expires since said at least one identifier was last displayed (col. 2, lines 1-7, col. 8, lines 48-61 and col. 14, lines 9-13. It would have been obvious to utilize one of the communication functions to reactivate after an elapse of a predetermined time).

Regarding claim 59, Saxena teaches at least one identifier is reactivated after the user causes a pointing device controlled cursor to enter into a defined region of said second GUI (col. 2, lines 1-7, col. 8, lines 48-61 and col. 14, lines 9-13. It would have been obvious to utilize one of the communication functions to reactivate after an elapse of a predetermined time; col. 3, lines 57-60 and Fig. 2 (222, 220)).

Regarding claim 60, Saxena teaches at least one identifier is reactivated after the user causes a pointing device controlled cursor to enter into a defined region of said second GUI and said cursor remains in said region for a definable period of time (col. 2, lines 1-7, col. 8, lines 48-61 and col. 14, lines 9-13. It would have been obvious to utilize one of the communication functions to reactivate after an elapse of a predetermined time; col. 3, 57-60, Fig. 2 (222, 220)).

Regarding claim 61, Saxena teaches at least one identifier is selectively displayed based on at least one user keyboard input (It would have been obvious to utilize Saxena's

Art Unit: 2674

communication functions for the purpose of identifying graphical user interfaces corresponding to different extension panel display screens; Fig. 2 (222, 221) and col. 3, lines 55-60).

Regarding claim 62, Saxena teaches at least one identifier includes information identifying said second program (Fig. 3 (304, 306, 308, 310, 312, 314) and col. 4, lines 31-41).

Regarding claim 63, Saxena teaches at least one identifier includes at least one user selectable feature that is operatively configured to provide at least one user input to said second program (Fig. 3., for example Fax (310); col. 4, lines 31-41).

Regarding claim 64, Saxena teaches said first program and said second program are operatively running on at least one processing unit within a single computer (Fig. 2 (202) and col. 3 and lines 28-46).

Regarding claim 65, Saxena teaches said first program and said second program are operatively running on at processing units within different computers (Fig. 1 (102, 104), and col. 3 and lines 28-46).

Conclusion

3. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the mailing date of this final action.

4. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communication from the examiner should be directed to **Abbas Abduselam** whose telephone number is **(703) 305-8591**. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday (9:00-5:30).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, **Richard Hjerpe**, can be reached at **(703) 305-4709**.

Any response to this action should be mailed to:

Commissioner of patents and Trademarks

Washington, D.C. 20231

or faxed to:

Art Unit: 2674

(703) 872-9314

Hand delivered responses should be brought to Crystal Park II, Crystal Drive, Arlington, VA, Sixth Floor (Receptionist).

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Technology center 2600 customer Service office whose telephone number is (703) 306-0377.

Abbas Abdulsalam

Examiner

Art Unit 2674

January 2, 2004


XIAO WU
PRIMARY EXAMINER